DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 981 SO 000 759

TITLE Federalism and the Academic Community: A Brief Survey.

INSTITUTION Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Mar 69

NOTE 64p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS American Government (Course); City Government; College Curriculum; *Curriculum Research; Federal State Relationship; Higher Education; *Local Government; National Surveys; *Political Science; *Public Administration Education; Questionnaires; School Surveys; Social Sciences; *State Government; Statistical Analysis; Statistical Surveys

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted in 1968 to determine the extent to which introductory, intermediate, and advanced courses in American State and local government and intergovernmental relations are contained in college and university political science curricula. A questionnaire (appended) was mailed to political science department chairmen of 833 colleges and universities; the study is based on the responses of 562 chairmen. The questionnaires contained three sets of questions directly relevant to the basic purpose of the study: 1) the extent to which their introductory course in political science included treatment of State and local government; 2) the approximate proportion of lecture time and course-related reading allocated to these fields in the introductory course; and, 3) the number of intermediate and advanced courses in State and local government and intergovernmental relations offered by their department. The survey's findings lead to an inescapable conclusion that the fields in question receive second-rate treatment in today's college and university political science curricula. Eight tables within the text and 67 in the appendices present data analysis of the responses. (Author/DJB)

ED054981

FEDERALISM AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY: A BRIEF SURVEY

An Information Report

M-44

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations
Washington, D. C. 20575
March 1969

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
March 1968

Private Citizens:
Farris Bryant, Jacksonville, Florida, Chairman
Alexander Heard, Nashville, Tennessee
Dorothy I. Cline, Albuquerque, New Mexico

Members of United States Senate:
Sam J. Ervin, Jr., North Carolina
Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota
Edmund S. Muskie, Maine

Members of United States House of Representatives:
Florence P. Dwyer, Mrs., New Jersey
L. H. Fountain, North Carolina
Al Ullman, Oregon

Officers of Executive Branch, Federal Government:
*Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare
*Robert P. Mayo, Director of Bureau of the Budget
*George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

Governors:
Buford Ellington, Tennessee
Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York
*Raymond P. Shafer, Pennsylvania
(Vacancy)

Mayors:
*Richard G. Lugar, Indianapolis, Indiana
Jack Maltester, San Leandro, California
Arthur Naftalin, Minneapolis, Minnesota
William F. Walsh, Syracuse, New York

Members of State Legislative Bodies:
*W. Russell Arrington, Senator, Illinois
*Robert P. Knowles, Senator, Wisconsin
Jesse M. Unruh, Assemblyman, California

Elected County Officials:
John F. Dever, Middlesex County, Massachusetts
Angus McDonald, Yakima County, Washington
Gladys N. Spellman, Prince George's County, Maryland

*Appointed to the Commission subsequent to the preparation of this report.

ED054981

FEDERALISM AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY:

A BRIEF SURVEY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

An Information Report

M-44

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations
Washington, D. C. 20575
March 1969

EDC24203

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 60 cents

PREFACE

In this Report, the Advisory Commission probes the current status of courses in American State and local government and intergovernmental relations in college and university political science curricula. The study seeks to determine the extent to which political science departments in higher educational institutions are fulfilling their instructional role in these fields. Specific areas receiving inadequate treatment are identified and certain possible explanations for the amount of attention given to these subjects are advanced.

The survey is based on the results of a questionnaire distributed to chairmen of political science departments, using a list supplied by the American Political Science Association. Replies are classified in terms of institutional enrollment size, regional location, and public-private control.

This Report contains no new suggestions of a policy character, and is issued strictly as an informational and reference document.

Farris Bryant
Chairman

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Responsibility for the preparation of this report was shared by David B. Walker and Carl W. Stenberg of the Commission staff. They benefited from a review of a draft of the report by a number of individuals, including Walter E. Beach and Earl M. Baker of the American Political Science Association, Allen D. Manvel, Research Associate with the Commission, and Royce Hanson, Director of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.

Statistical assistance was provided by Francis X. Tippett. The manuscript was typed by Carolyn LeVere, Linda Topham, and Vicki Watts.

Wm. G. Colman
Executive Director

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Introduction	1
Methodology	2
Findings	3
Introductory Courses–Their Nature	3
Overall Introductory Treatment	3
Introductory Lecture Time	4
Introductory Reading Assignments	5
Overall Intermediate and Advanced Treatment	7
State-Local and Local Government	9
State Government and Intergovernmental Relations	11
Conclusions	13

TABLES

1.	Extent of Treatment of State and Local Government in Introductory Political Science Course	4
2.	Approximate Proportion of Lecture Time Allocated to State and Local Government in Introductory Political Science Course	5
3.	Approximate Proportion of Course – Related Reading Allocated to State and Local Government in Introductory Political Science Course	6
4.	Total Number of Intermediate and Advanced Courses in State and Local Government and Intergovernmental Relations	8
5.	Number of Intermediate and Advanced Courses in State-Local Government	9
6.	Number of Intermediate and Advanced Courses in Local Government	10
7.	Number of Intermediate and Advanced Courses in State Government	11
8.	Number of Intermediate and Advanced Courses in Intergovernmental Relations	12

7

APPENDIX TABLES

		Page
A-1	ACIR-APSA Questionnaire	15-16
A-2(A)	Respondents to ACIR-APSA Questionnaire Survey, By Institutional Size, Location, and Control	17
A-2(B)	Non-Respondents to ACIR-APSA Questionnaire Survey, By Institutional Size, Location, and Control	18
A-3	Number of Institutions Included in Survey, By Region and State	19
B1-B8	Extent of Treatment of State and Local Government in Introductory Political Science Course, By Institutional Size, Location, and Control	20-23
C1-C8	Approximate Proportion of Lecture Time Allocated to State and Local Government in Introductory Political Science Course, By Institutional Size, Location, and Control	24-27
D1-D8	Approximate Proportion of Course-Related Reading Allocated to State and Local Government in Introductory Political Science Course, By Institutional Size, Location, and Control	28-31
E1-E8	Total Number of Intermediate and Advanced Courses in State and Local Government and Intergovernmental Relations, By Institutional Size, Location, and Control	32-35
F1-F8	Number of Intermediate and Advanced Courses in State-Local Government, By Institutional Size, Location, and Control	36-39
G1-G8	Number of Intermediate and Advanced Courses in Local Government, By Institutional Size, Location, and Control	40-43
H1-H8	Number of Intermediate and Advanced Courses in State Government, By Institutional Size, Location, and Control	44-47
I1-I8	Number of Intermediate and Advanced Courses in Intergovernmental Relations, by Institutional Size, Location, and Control	48-51
J	Works used for Reading Assignments in Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced Courses in State and Local Government and Intergovernmental Relations, By Ten Most Frequently Mentioned Works	52-55

FEDERALISM AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY: A BRIEF SURVEY

Introduction

No general consensus exists concerning the status of American State and local government and intergovernmental relations as fields within the discipline of political science. Any attempt to make such an evaluation by gauging the attention given to these subjects in colleges and universities should distinguish between the two basic traditional roles of American higher educational institutions--research and teaching.

Some observers have noted that in recent years political scientists have become increasingly interested in conducting research in American State and local government.[1] As late as 1963, however, a large number of the members of the American Political Science Association responding to a questionnaire survey of trends in their discipline indicated that State and local government were areas in which the least significant work was being done.[2] Yet, five years later, in a symposium on the advance of political science as a discipline, it was contended that:

> State and local politics as a field of political science is no longer a 'lost world' or the site of 'Dullsville.' Rather than being the laggard of the discipline that some political scientists perceive it to be, the study of state and local politics has reentered the mainstream of political research. Much of the work in political science which has influenced the drift of the profession has been within its domain.[3]

Academic research in American intergovernmental (Federal-State-local) relations has not as yet entered the "mainstream" of the political science discipline. As one participant in the Third Annual Orvil E. Dryfoos Conference on Public Affairs, held in 1966 to explore the nature, significance, and implications of the "new federalism," asserted: "There is very little doubt . . . that one of the most challenging and badly neglected areas of research relates to the problems associated with the new federalism."[4]

This study focuses on the instructional rather than the research role of colleges and universities. While these functions are related, it is quite conceivable that advances in one area may not be transmitted to the other. The recent increasing popularity of State and local government and the gradual advance of intergovernmental relations as subjects of academic research, then, may not be producing a correspondingly greater classroom attention to these fields. This possibility prompted the Advisory Commission to undertake a survey to determine the extent to which introductory, intermediate, and advanced courses in American State and local government and intergovernmental relations are contained in college and university political science curricula.

---

[1] See Herbert Jacob and Michael Lipsky, "Outputs, Structure, and Power: An Assessment of Changes in the Study of State and Local Politics," *Journal of Politics,* 30, No. 2 (May 1968), pp. 510-38.

[2] Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus, "Trends in American Political Science: Some Analytical Notes," *American Political Science Review,* LVII, No. 4 (December 1963), pp. 933-47.

[3] Jacob and Lipsky, *op. cit.*, p. 510.

[4] Frank Smallwood. "The Role of the College in the New Federalism," in *The New Federalism: A Conference Report, Third Annual Orvil E. Dryfoos Conference on Public Affairs,* ed. Frank Smallwood (Hanover, N.H.: Public Affairs Center, Dartmouth College, March 1967), p. 73.

Methodology

In May 1968 questionnaires were distributed by the ACIR, using a list supplied by the American Political Science Association, to political science department chairmen of 883 colleges and universities in the United States. The doctorate in political science was not offered in the majority of the institutions surveyed. In August, a second round of questionnaires was sent to those institutions which had initially failed to reply. The study is based upon the responses of 562 chairmen.

The final return rate of 63.6 percent was generally free from bias.[5] As indicated in Appendix A-2, over forty-four percent of the 562 who answered the questionnaire and almost sixty-five percent of the 321 who failed to reply represented institutions with an enrollment of less than 2,000. Yet, this was not unexpected, since nearly fifty-two percent of the questionnaires were sent to chairmen of political science departments in institutions of this size. A relatively large number of replies were received from colleges and universities situated in the Southeastern, Mideastern, Great Lakes, and Plains regions. Again, this is basically in accord with the location of the institutions surveyed; about twenty-five percent were in the Southeast, nineteen percent in the Mideast, sixteen percent in the Great Lakes, and thirteen percent in the Plains. Finally, while about sixty percent of the answers and seventy-four percent of the failures to respond came from private colleges and universities, this is a reflection of the fact that over sixty-five percent of the institutions surveyed were under private control. To summarize, while returns were incomplete, the parallel distribution of responding and non-responding institutions suggests that the survey is generally representative, and affords an adequate basis for generalizations concerning the status of courses in State and local government and intergovernmental relations in political science curricula.

Chairmen were asked three sets of questions directly relevant to the basic purpose of the study: (1) the extent to which their introductory course in political science included treatment of State and local government; (2) the approximate proportion of lecture time and course-related reading allocated to these fields in the introductory course; and (3) the number of intermediate and advanced courses in State and local government and intergovernmental relations offered by their department. Other questions dealt with the works used for reading assignments,[6] and the usefulness of ACIR reports in introductory, intermediate, and advanced courses in these fields.[7]

Replies to all of the above questions, except for those dealing with reading assignments, were classified and tabulated in terms of three factors: (1) the total enrollment of the institution, including the number of full- and part-time resident undergraduate and postbaccalaureate students[8] as of Fall 1967 as reported by the Office of Education of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;[9] (2) the geographical region

---

[5] A copy of the ACIR-APSA questionnaire and a breakdown of respondents and non-respondents by institutional size, location, and control are contained in Appendix A1-A2.

[6] Many respondents did not answer the two questions concerning works used for reading assignments in introductory, intermediate, and advanced level courses in State and local government and intergovernmental relations. They indicated that this was due to the number and variety of works assigned in these courses. Appendix J summarizes the replies to this question by listing the ten most frequently mentioned works in each of these subject areas.

[7] The two questions dealing with the usefulness of ACIR reports were designed to elicit information of primary interest to the Advisory Commission, and therefore are not treated in detail in this study. In summary, the 464 replies to a question concerning the usefulness of these reports in State and local government courses were divided as follows: "Very useful"–20.5 percent; "Occasionally useful"–55.2 percent; "Not useful"–11.8 percent; "Not received, not known"–12.5 percent. With reference to intergovernmental relations courses, the 231 replies were grouped as follows: "Very useful"–26.0 percent; "Occasionally useful"–37.6 percent; "Not useful"–11.7 percent; "Not received, not known"–24.7 percent.

[8] Replies from institutions having a political science enrollment consisting wholly or predominantly of postbaccalaureate rather than undergraduate students were not tabulated.

[9] U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1967, Supplement A: Undergraduate and Postbaccalaureate Students,* by Marjorie O. Chandler and Mabel C. Rice (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968).

in which the college or university was located;[10] and (3) whether the institution was publicly or privately controlled. These factors reflect certain assumptions: the number of course offerings in State and local government and intergovernmental relations would probably increase in accordance with institutional size; some regions more than others would tend to give attention to these fields; and publicly supported institutions would be more likely to provide for course treatment of one or more of these subject areas due to State legislative requirements.

Findings

Introductory Courses–Their Nature: Chairmen were asked to indicate the duration of the introductory course in political science offered by their department and the extent to which it included treatment of American State and local government. Fifty-two percent answered that the basic course lasted for one semester, while almost fifteen percent pointed out that it was a one quarter course. A sizeable minority–twenty-six percent–noted that their introductory course was two semesters in length. Some chairmen, particularly those in larger universities, replied that their basic course was designed as a broad survey of the nature, scope, and objectives of political science as an academic discipline rather than as a preface to specific area studies. For this reason, they stated that no attention was given to State and local government in this course. On the other hand, a number of the respondents having a two-semester introductory course–with the first semester allocated to the study of American national government and the second to State and local government–indicated that the treatment given to the latter fields was "substantial."

Overall Introductory Treatment: Table 1 shows that almost fifty-six percent of the responding departments gave "some" attention to State and local government in their introductory political science course, while over twenty-three percent provided for no treatment of these fields. Nearly twenty-one percent of the respondents claimed that "substantial" attention was given to State and local government at the introductory level. It should be noted, however, that most of these replies were applicable to basic courses which lasted for one semester. From this table, institutional size alone would not appear to be significantly associated with the focus given to these subjects.

Appendix Tables B1-B8 provide a more detailed breakdown of these replies. In terms of regional patterns, New England (71%) and the Far West (72%) had significantly higher proportions of "some" responses than the national average (55.6%), while the Southwest (33%) was far below this mark. On the other hand, the intraregional division of "substantial" answers shows that New England (5%) and the Mideast (13%) fell well under the national proportion (20.8%), and that the total for the Southwest was two and one-half times the national figure. For the "none" replies, the Plains (38%), the Mideast (29%), and the Rocky Mountains (26%) surpassed the overall national percentage (23.6%), while the Far West (13%), the Southwest (14%), and the Great Lakes (17%) had the lowest regional proportions for this category.

In terms of the public-private character of educational institutions, the nationwide totals indicate that about sixty-two percent of those colleges and universities falling in the "some" response category were private and thirty-eight percent were public. On a regional basis, only the Great Lakes States came close to paralleling these figures. For those institutions within the "substantial" group, about forty-four percent were public and fifty-six percent were private. Among the eight regions, however, there were wide variations with only three–the Great Lakes, the Far West, and the Southeast–bearing much resemblance to the national composition. The overall pattern of "none" replies indicates a 43-57 percentage distribution between public and private colleges and universities, respectively, with both New England and the Great

---

[10]The eight-fold regional classification utilized in tabulating the questionnaire responses conforms to that used by the Office of Education in *Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1967.* See Appendix Table A-3 for a listing of the number of institutions included in the survey by region and State.

339-650 O - 69 - 2

Table 1

EXTENT OF TREATMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INTRODUCTORY POLITICAL SCIENCE COURSE

(By Enrollment Size of Institution)

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number*	Percent Distribution		
		None	Some	Substantial
Total	552	23.6	55.6	20.8
Under 1,000	97	19.6	58.8	21.6
1,000 – 1,999	146	22.6	60.3	17.1
2,000 – 3,499	73	21.9	54.8	23.3
3,500 – 4,999	46	23.9	43.5	32.6
5,000 – 7,499	49	30.6	42.9	26.5
7,500 – 9,999	43	25.6	60.5	13.9
10,000 – 14,999	42	26.2	57.1	16.7
15,000 – 19,999	28	21.4	60.7	17.9
20,000 or over	28	28.6	50.0	21.4

*Respondents not providing data on this item number 10.

Lakes corresponding to this division. In short, for all three response categories the major regional finding with respect to the public-private factor is one of great diversity.

Introductory Lecture Time: In order to gain a clearer perspective concerning the extent to which State and local government receive treatment in introductory level political science courses, chairmen were asked what approximate proportion of lecture time and course-related reading was allocated to these fields. With reference to the former, Table 2 reveals that nearly forty-seven percent of the respondents answered that "less than one-fourth" of the lecture time in their introductory course was allotted to State and local government, while over twenty-four percent replied that no lecture time was provided for these subjects. The remaining twenty-nine percent of these departmental chairmen indicated that "one-fourth or more" of the basic course lecture time was devoted to State and local government.

In terms of enrollment size, no clear pattern is revealed, although institutions in the 7,500-9,999 (15%) and 10,000-14,999 (19%) classes tended to fall well below the overall figure (28.9%) for allocating "one-fourth or more" of the introductory lecture time to these topics. The percentages in this category for the smaller colleges (under 1,000–38%; 1,000-1,999–25%; 2,000-3,499–39%) either surpassed or were on a level equivalent with the figures for the multi-university groups (15,000-19,999–26% and 20,000 or over–31%).

The regional breakdown of these responses (see Appendix Tables C1-C8) shows that institutions located in the Southwest (46%), the Rocky Mountains (45%), and the Southeast (42%) far surpassed the national average (28.9%) for allocating "one-fourth or more" of basic course lecture time to State and local government. Those in New England (11%), the Great Lakes (15%), and the Mideast (17%) were well below the overall figure. The intraregional division for the "less than one-fourth" category finds New England (68%) and the Far West (58%) far above the nationwide average (46.9%), while the Rocky Mountains (30%), the Southeast

Table 2

APPROXIMATE PROPORTION OF LECTURE TIME ALLOCATED TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INTRODUCTORY POLITICAL SCIENCE COURSE

(By Enrollment Size of Institution)

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number*	Percent Distribution				
		1/2	1/3	1/4	Less Than 1/4	None
Total	525	8.2	6.8	13.9	46.9	24.2
Under 1,000	91	8.8	12.1	17.5	42.9	18.7
1,000 – 1,999	140	10.0	2.1	12.9	54.3	20.7
2,000 – 3,499	70	15.7	7.1	15.7	41.5	20.0
3,500 – 4,999	40	2.5	12.5	17.5	37.5	30.0
5,000 – 7,499	49	8.2	6.1	12.2	40.8	32.7
7,500 – 9,999	40	2.5	7.5	5.0	55.0	30.0
10,000 – 14,999	42	4.8	7.1	7.1	47.7	33.3
15,000 – 19,999	27	7.4	7.4	11.1	51.9	22.2
20,000 or over	26	–	3.9	26.9	42.3	26.9

*Respondents not providing data on this item number 37.

(38%), and the Southwest (41%) ranged below this level. The "none" replies clustered more heavily in the Great Lakes (39%) and the Mideast (32%), while the proportions for Far Western and Southwestern institutions were half the 24.2 percent national figure.

With reference to the public-private variable, about fifty-eight percent of the nationwide total for the "one-fourth or more" responses came from private and forty-two percent from public institutions. Of these, the intraregional proportions for the Southwest (68%) and the Rocky Mountains (67%) significantly exceeded the national public average, while the Great Lakes (92%) and the Mideast (67%) were well above the overall private figure. A quite similar total percentage breakdown (57%—private, 43%—public) was indicated for the "none" group. Public institutions in the Rocky Mountains (80%), the Far West (67%), the Southwest (60%), and the Southeast (57%) greatly surpassed the national level, while those under private control in the Mideast (70%) and the Great Lakes (65%) again far outstripped the national average. Of the "less than one-fourth" answers, about thirty-eight percent came from public and sixty-two percent from private institutions, with intraregional proportions markedly exceeding the national figures for public institutions in the Southwest (53%) and the Rocky Mountains (50%), and those for private colleges and universities in New England (77%), and the Mideast (69%).

Introductory Reading Assignments: Not surprisingly, the pattern of replies to the question dealing with the amount of State and local reading assigned in the introductory political science course closely paralleled that relating to the amount of lecture time devoted to these fields. As Table 3 reveals, forty-five percent of the responding departments allotted "less than one-fourth" of the basic course-related reading to State and local government, while for over twenty-seven percent no course-related reading was assigned for these subjects. Chairmen of the remaining departments noted that State and local government were allocated "one-fourth or more" of the assigned reading in their introductory course.

Table 3

APPROXIMATE PROPORTION OF COURSE-RELATED READING ALLOCATED TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INTRODUCTORY POLITICAL SCIENCE COURSE

(By Enrollment Size of Institution)

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number*	Percent Distribution				
		1/2	1/3	1/4	Less Than 1/4	None
Total	519	8.3	6.5	12.7	45.1	27.4
Under 1,000	91	7.7	7.7	18.7	45.0	20.9
1,000 – 1,999	139	8.6	3.6	10.8	51.8	25.2
2,000 – 3,499	69	14.5	8.7	14.5	36.2	26.1
3,500 – 4,999	40	2.5	7.5	17.5	42.5	30.0
5,000 – 7,499	49	10.2	6.1	8.2	38.8	36.7
7,500 – 9,999	39	5.1	7.7	7.7	48.7	30.8
10,000 – 14,999	40	7.5	7.5	5.0	45.0	35.0
15,000 – 19,999	26	7.7	7.7	11.6	53.8	19.2
20,000 or over	26	3.9	7.7	19.2	34.6	34.6

*Respondents not providing data on this item number 43.

Focusing on the enrollment factor, again no meaningful relationship appears between size and the proportion of basic reading time assigned to these subject areas. With reference to the "one-fourth or more" responses, for example, small colleges under 1,000 and those with an enrollment from 2,000 to 3,499 gave much greater attention to State and local reading assignments (34% and 38%, respectively) than multi-universities (15,000-19,999–27% and 20,000 or over–31%), and were markedly above the national benchmark (27.5%). At the same time, colleges from 1,000-1,999 were more than four percentage points below the overall figure for this response group, but about three points above institutions having enrollments of 7,500-14,999.

The breakdown of replies in terms of region and institutional control (see Appendix Tables D1-D8) indicates a pattern which, with only a few exceptions, closely resembles that in Appendix C. Institutions located in the Southwest (50%), the Rocky Mountains (45%), the Far West (38%), the Southeast (36%), and the Plains (33%) exceeded the national response average (27.5%) for "one-fourth or more" of the introductory course reading time allotted to State and local government, while those in New England (11%), the Mideast (15%), and the Great Lakes (14%) fell well below this figure. With respect to the "less than one-fourth" group, institutions in New England (65%) and the Mideast (52%) surpassed the national average (45.1%), while those in the Rocky Mountains (20%), the Southwest (35%), and the Southeast (39%) were well beneath this level. The intraregional clustering for "none" responses relative to the 27.4 percent national average was heaviest in the Great Lakes (40%), the Rocky Mountains (35%), and the Mideast (33%), and lightest in the Far West (13%) and the Southwest (15%).

A breakdown of the intraregional proportions in terms of the public and private variables reveals a similar mirroring of Appendix C. An overall forty-five percent of the "one-fourth or more" responses came from public institutions. Of these, the Rocky Mountains (78%) and the Southwest (70%)

significantly exceeded, while the Great Lakes (17%) and the Mideast (27%) were substantially less than the nationwide average. With reference to the "less than one-fourth" group, the thirty-seven percent total public response was outstripped by the Southwest (50%), the Rocky Mountains (50%), and the Far West (48%), while New England (75%) was well above the overall private percentage. Finally, for the "none" replies, the Southwest (67%), the Rocky Mountains (57%), and the Far West (57%) surpassed the nationwide forty-two percent public average, while the Mideast (71%) and the Great Lakes (66%) greatly exceeded the total private figure.

In light of the foregoing, it is reasonable to conclude that the fields of State and local government receive rather limited attention in college and university introductory political science courses. Analysis of the regional breakdown of responses to questions dealing with the extent of treatment and the proportion of reading and lecture time given to State and local government reveals that institutions in the Mideast, the Great Lakes, and the Rocky Mountains generally exceeded the national average for devoting no attention to these subject areas. For the "some" or "less than one-fourth" category, New England and the Far West were usually above the overall figure. The nationwide proportion for the "substantial" or "one-fourth or more" group was frequently surpassed by the Southwest and the Southeast, and occasionally by the Rocky Mountains. In terms of the private-public control variable, there were no significant regional departures from the overall 60-40 private-public percentage division for the survey respondents.

Overall Intermediate and Advanced Treatment: To probe the extent to which political science curricula deal with State and local government as well as with intergovernmental relations at the intermediate and advanced levels, chairmen were requested to cite the number of courses in these fields offered by their institutions. Since the Advisory Commission was concerned with courses which were wholly or predominantly devoted to each of these subjects, the following classification was used: State government, local government, State-local government, and intergovernmental relations. At the outset, however, it was recognized that reliance on this breakdown might present some problems for chairmen of political science departments in which course offerings followed the currently popular "process"—rather than the more traditional "institutional"—approach. It also was understood that in some colleges and universities these subjects were studied within the context of public administration, economics, history, sociology, or interdisciplinary courses, rather than receiving exclusive attention as separate course designations. Replies from chairmen who indicated that State and local government and intergovernmental relations were treated in such a manner by their department did not lend themselves to tabulation.

Chairmen were asked the total number of intermediate and advanced courses in State and local government and intergovernmental relations given by their department. Over thirty percent of the departments responding offered a course in one of the above areas, while nearly twenty-one percent had no such courses in their political science curriculum (see Table 4). The remaining forty-nine percent represented departments which had two or more courses in these fields, with about eighteen percent having two courses, nine percent—three courses, and twenty-two percent—four or more courses.

As contrasted with the findings relating to basic courses, the number of intermediate and advanced offerings was closely associated with institutional size. Table 4 demonstrates that colleges and universities having a total enrollment of less than 3,500 were well above the national average for having no courses in State and local government and intergovernmental relations. At the same time, those under 2,000 far outdistanced the overall figure for the "one course" category. Institutions with an enrollment of 3,500 or over exhibited a marked tendency to have two or three courses in these subject areas, and those over 5,000 significantly exceeded the nationwide average for the "four or more" group.

In terms of the regional breakdown, Appendix Tables E1-E8 show that institutions in the Plains (27%) and the Southeast (26%) were well above the national average (20.7%) for having no course offerings in State and local government and intergovernmental relations, while the Southwest (5%) was no where near this mark. The intraregional division for the "one course" category finds New England (37%), the Mideast (35%),

Table 4

TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED COURSES IN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

(By Enrollment Size of Institution)

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number*	Percent Distribution				
		No Course	One Course	Two Courses	Three Courses	Four or More Courses
Total	550	20.7	30.3	18.2	9.3	21.5
Under 1,000	97	45.4	39.2	8.2	3.1	4.1
1,000 – 1,999	146	28.8	48.6	15.1	4.8	2.7
2,000 – 3,499	71	25.4	26.8	26.7	11.2	9.9
3,500 – 4,999	45	2.2	35.6	31.1	17.8	13.3
5,000 – 7,499	51	7.8	27.5	25.5	7.8	31.4
7,500 – 9,999	41	7.3	9.8	24.4	17.1	41.4
10,000 – 14,999	43	2.3	9.3	18.6	11.7	58.1
15,000 – 19,999	28	3.6	–	17.9	7.1	71.4
20,000 or over	28	–	3.6	3.6	25.0	67.8

*Respondents not providing data on this item number 12.

and the Great Lakes (34%) slightly above the overall figure (30.3%), and the Rocky Mountains (16%), the Far West (25%), and the Southeast (26%) under this level. For the "two courses" group, while the Mideast (28%), the Southwest (25%), and the Southeast (19%) surpassed the national average (18.2%), all of the remaining regions except the Great Lakes (17%) ranged from five to thirteen percentage points below this benchmark. The "three courses" category was relatively evenly spread, with only New England (16%), the Mideast (6%), and the Rocky Mountains (5%) significantly diverging from the overall percentage (9.3%). Finally, for the "four or more" group, institutions in New England (16%) and the Mideast (15%) scored well below the national average (21.5%), while those in the Rocky Mountains (53%), the Far West (28%), and the Southwest (27%) exceeded this figure.

Dividing the responses in accordance with the public-private factor reveals that only eighteen percent of the "no course" offerings fell into the public category. State-supported institutions in the Southwest (50%), the Rocky Mountains (50%), and the Mideast (33%), however, departed dramatically from this overall pattern. The eighty-two percent private average was surpassed by New England (100%), the Great Lakes (95%), and the Far West (92%). "One course" replies divided on a 22-78 public-private percentage basis. The Southeast (31%) was well above the former, and New England (93%) and the Great Lakes (88%) outstripped the latter. The public-private percentage was evenly split for the "two courses" category, with all regions except New England (25%), the Mideast (33%), and the Great Lakes (43%) exceeding the public figure, while the opposite effect was discernible for the private sector. Variances from the 61-39 public-private percentage breakdown for the "three courses" group included public replies from the Far West (83%) and the Southwest (80%), while New England, the Mideast, and the Great Lakes, divided evenly in terms of public-private control. Finally, for the "four or more courses" column, the 70-30 public-private percentage

division was equalled or surpassed by institutions in all regions except the Mideast (37%-63%) and New England (50%-50%).

State-Local and Local Government: Dividing these non-basic courses into four separate categories–State-local government, local government, State government, and intergovernmental relations–provides a clearer view of the extent to which these subjects are covered at the intermediate and advanced levels in political science departments. Tables 5 through 8 reveal that State-local government and local government receive considerably more attention than State government and intergovernmental relations. Table 5 shows that forty-seven percent of the chairmen responding to this item indicated that their department gave only one intermediate or advanced course in State-local government, and a nearly equal number replied that no such courses were included in their curriculum.

In terms of institutional size, generally no meaningful relationships can be found. Witness the fact that the smallest and largest enrollment categories ranked highest in the "no course" column, and the same two groups ranked lowest in the "one course" column. The only real exception to this finding is the clustering of replies from institutions over 5,000 in the "two" and "three courses" categories. The "four or more courses" percentages were grouped exclusively within the middle-size sector.

From Appendix Tables F1-F8, it is apparent that no marked intraregional differences appear among the "no course" responses; only colleges and universities in the Plains States (53%) departed to any marked degree from the national figure (46.5%) for this category. For the "one course" group, the overall average (47.2%) was outdistanced by New England (55%), the Great Lakes (54%), and the Mideast (52%), and under-represented by the Plains (36%), the Rocky Mountains (37%), and the Southeast (42%). The breakdown for

Table 5

NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED COURSES IN STATE-LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(By Enrollment Size of Institution)

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number*	Percent Distribution				
		No Course	One Course	Two Courses	Three Courses	Four or More Courses
Total	540	46.5	47.2	4.4	1.3	0.6
Under 1,000	97	60.8	37.1	2.1	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	143	47.6	49.0	2.8	0.6	–
2,000 – 3,499	71	45.1	50.7	2.8	–	1.4
3,500 – 4,999	41	26.9	68.3	2.4	–	2.4
5,000 – 7,499	51	39.2	47.1	7.8	3.9	2.0
7,500 – 9,999	41	39.0	48.8	12.2	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	40	47.5	47.5	5.0	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	28	39.3	46.5	7.1	7.1	–
20,000 or over	28	53.6	32.2	7.1	7.1	–

*Respondents not providing data on this item number 22.

the "two or more courses" replies reveals that only the Rocky Mountains (21%), the Plains (11%), and the Southeast (11%) outstripped the national aggregate (6.3%) to any significant extent.

The public-private divisions show that four of the eight regions do not diverge markedly from the 36-64 public-private percentage split on the "no course" responses. The major deviations from this pattern were private colleges and universities in New England (94%) and the Mideast (71%), and public institutions in the Southwest (68%) and the Rocky Mountains (75%).

A roughly parallel division of replies is highlighted in Table 6, which shows the number of intermediate and advanced courses in local government included in political science curricula. In this case, however, a greater number of chairmen—nearly fifty-five percent—stated that no courses were offered in this field. The remaining answers were more evenly distributed than those relating to courses in State-local government: about twenty-seven percent indicated that they had one local government course; eleven percent—two courses; three percent—three courses; and five percent—four or more courses.

In terms of institutional size, the pattern of "no course" responses in general suggests that the smaller the enrollment the greater likelihood that local government courses are not offered. For the "one course" and "three courses" categories, no consistent progression in relation to size is shown. The table reveals some relationship between greater size and the tendency to offer two courses, and a definite association between these two factors in the "four or more courses" column.

Appendix Tables G1-G8 indicate a greater tendency, relative to the national average (54.8%), for Plains (61%), Southeastern (62%), and New England (61%) institutions not to have any local government courses. On the other hand, the Southwest (59%) and the Mideast (54%) provided the best showings for institutions

Table 6

NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED COURSES IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(By Enrollment Size of Institution)

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number*	Percent Distribution				
		No Course	One Course	Two Courses	Three Courses	Four or More Courses
Total	546	54.8	26.6	10.9	3.1	4.6
Under 1,000	97	87.6	12.4	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	145	83.4	15.9	0.7	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	69	58.0	33.3	7.2	–	1.5
3,500 – 4,999	44	47.7	43.2	9.1	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	52	34.6	34.6	19.3	7.7	3.8
7,500 – 9,999	42	19.1	35.7	19.1	21.4	4.7
10,000 – 14,999	41	4.9	36.6	36.6	4.9	17.0
15,000 – 19,999	28	7.1	42.9	25.0	3.6	21.4
20,000 or over	28	7.1	28.6	35.7	3.6	25.0

*Respondents not providing data on this item number 16.

offering at least one course in this field. Significant variances from the overall 24-76 public-private division of responses for the "no course" category occurred in five regions: New England (9% public–91% private), the Great Lakes (8% public–92% private), the Far West (17% public–83% private), the Southwest (33% public–67% private), and the Rocky Mountains (60% public–40% private).

State Government and Intergovernmental Relations: When compared to the other fields covered in this survey, State government and intergovernmental relations are the most neglected areas of teaching at the intermediate and advanced levels (See Tables 7 and 8). In seventy-three percent of the responding political science departments, no State government courses were provided, while in nearly seventy-seven percent no intergovernmental relations courses were given. Only nineteen percent of the State government and eighteen percent of the intergovernmental relations answers fell within the "one course" category.

The breakdown of replies in Table 7 by enrollment indicates a fairly clear progression between greater institutional size and the tendency to offer one or more courses in State government. The figures in Table 8 depict a somewhat similar pattern, although the comparatively high proportion of "no course" replies from the 10,000-14,999 class constitutes the chief factor qualifying this generalization.[11] Both tables show a clear pattern in which colleges under 3,500 far exceed the national average for "no course" offerings and fall well below the overall figure for the "one course" category.

[11] Another variable affecting the number of courses in State government is the legislative requirement that publicly-supported institutions provide a course dealing with the government of their State–one which all students or only those enrolled in certain degree programs must complete in order to graduate. Comments on introductory, intermediate, and advanced level reading assignments indicate that courses are offered in the government and/or politics of about one-half of the States. Inquiries to selected chairmen of political science departments, however, reveal that only seven States–Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Nevada, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming–have laws which mandate the teaching of a course in the government and/or politics of the State at the college level.

Table 7

NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED COURSES IN STATE GOVERNMENT

(By Enrollment Size of Institution)

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number*	Percent Distribution				
		No Course	One Course	Two Courses	Three Courses	Four or More Courses
Total	547	73.3	19.4	4.6	2.0	0.7
Under 1,000	97	94.8	5.2	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	144	90.3	9.7	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	71	80.3	16.9	1.4	1.4	–
3,500 – 4,999	44	70.4	27.3	2.3	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	52	69.3	19.2	7.7	–	3.8
7,500 – 9,999	42	52.4	33.4	7.1	7.1	–
10,000 – 14,999	41	39.0	41.5	17.1	2.4	–
15,000 – 19,999	28	32.1	32.1	17.9	14.3	3.6
20,000 or over	28	28.6	46.4	14.3	7.1	3.6

*Respondents not providing data on this item number 15.

339-650 O - 69 - 3

Table 8

NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED COURSES IN INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

(By Enrollment Size of Institution)

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number*	Percent Distribution				
		No Course	One Course	Two Courses	Three Courses	Four or More Courses
Total	546	76.7	18.3	3.1	1.5	0.4
Under 1,000	96	83.3	11.5	4.2	1.0	–
1,000 – 1,999	146	85.6	12.3	2.1	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	70	81.5	15.7	1.4	1.4	–
3,500 – 4,999	44	77.2	18.2	2.3	2.3	–
5,000 – 7,499	52	71.2	21.2	1.9	3.8	1.9
7,500 – 9,999	42	66.6	26.2	2.4	4.8	–
10,000 – 14,999	41	73.2	19.5	4.9	–	2.4
15,000 – 19,999	28	57.1	35.7	7.2	–	–
20,000 or over	27	44.4	44.4	7.5	3.7	–

*Respondents not providing data on this item number 16.

Appendix Tables H1-H8 reveal that institutions in the Southwest (41%), the Rocky Mountains (40%), and the Far West (39%) were far more likely, relative to the overall national average (26.7%), to offer one or more State government courses. By way of contrast, the Mideast (20%) and New England (18%) were the main regions which ignored this subject area in their intermediate and advanced level political science courses. Nevertheless, as indicated in Appendix Tables I1-I8, the Rocky Mountains (40%) and New England (34%) far outdistanced the national percentage (23.3%) for one or more course offerings in intergovernmental relations, while institutions in the Plains States (83%), followed closely by the Mideast (81%), provided the largest clusterings of "no course" replies.

Analysis of these Appendix Tables in terms of the public-private variable shows, with respect to State government, that public institutions in the Rocky Mountains (58%) and the Southwest (42%) significantly exceeded the overall public proportion (29%) for "no course" offerings, while New England (87%) and the Great Lakes (82%) were well above the overall private sector figure (71%). The breakdown for "no course" in intergovernmental relations also shows four regions departing dramatically from the public-private nationwide division (35%-65%): New England (8%-92%), the Great Lakes (23%-77%), the Southwest (53%-47%), and the Rocky Mountains (58%-42%).

To summarize, the regional breakdown of responses to a series of questions concerning the number of intermediate and advanced course offerings in State-local government, local government, State government, and intergovernmental relations indicates that the Plains and the Southeast generally surpassed the national average for having no courses in these subject areas. On the other hand, the Southwest and the Rocky Mountains usually exceeded the overall figure for the "one or more" courses group, although New England was occasionally above the average.

As contrasted with the findings for introductory courses, the private-public percentages for intermediate and advanced offerings deviated sharply from the overall 60-40 private-public breakdown for survey respondents. Each category of reply to the question dealing with the total number of such courses in State and local government and intergovernmental relations divided as follows: no course–82% private-18% public; one course–78%-22%; two courses–50%-50%; three courses–39%-61%; and four or more courses–30%-70%. For the four specific intermediate and advanced courses surveyed, the various "none" responses were distributed on the following private-public basis: 64%-36%–no State-local government courses; 76%-24%–no local government courses; 71%-29%–no State government courses; and 65%-35%–no intergovernmental relations courses. These findings suggest strongly that publicly-supported colleges and universities give proportionately more attention to these fields than institutions which are under private control.

Conclusions

This survey's findings lead to an inescapable conclusion that the fields of American State and local government and intergovernmental relations receive second-rate treatment in today's college and university political science curricula. While a majority of political science departments give some attention to State and local government in introductory reading assignments and lectures, a strong minority ignore these areas at this level. Equally significant, only a handful report really substantial coverage of these critical subjects in their basic courses.

The situation at the intermediate and advanced course levels is even more bleak. A majority of the responding departments have no courses which focus wholly or partially on local government. This may be accounted for in part by the tendency among larger universities to deal with these subjects in separate centers for governmental research and urban studies. Finally, the survey responses dramatically document the fact that State government and intergovernmental relations are indeed the "dark continents" of teaching at the college and university level, with about three-fourths of the 562 responding departments offering no course in either field.

Why do State and local government and intergovernmental relations receive so little instructional focus in higher educational institutions? Why this scant attention in light of the growing appeal of these areas as research topics? The summary tables and appendices suggest strongly that the degree of specialization called for here is for the most part only feasibl in larger institutions. Some survey respondents explained that their failure to offer such courses was due to difficulties in obtaining teaching personnel with the requisite qualifications. Another possible reason suggested in certain questionnaire responses is the tendency of the "process" approach in developing political science departmental curricula to ignore or to treat slightingly these intergovernmental subject areas, since they are rooted in an institutional framework and in some cases are taught by so-called "traditionalists."

Going beyond the questionnaire, courses in these areas generally–and roughly since World War II–have been unable to compete successfully with the glamor of international relations, underdeveloped areas, comparative political systems, American national government, and political parties and behavior. The virtual neglect of State government and intergovernmental relations could be attributed to the fairly low visibility of these fields until fairly recently. The complex and interdisciplinary nature of intergovernmental relations and the low esteem in which many political scientists hold State government might well be additional reasons for this neglect. The somewhat greater popularity of State-local and local government courses could be a reflection of increasing concern on the part of both public officials and scholars with the far-reaching implications of the "crisis of the cities." The enthusiasm of some academicians for community power structure studies also might be a factor explaining the relatively larger number of courses in these subject areas. On the other hand, many offerings in State-local and local government could well be simply leftovers from the "traditionalist" period, with their current inclusion in political science curricula attributable more to custom and convenience than to actual need and demand.

Conjectures notwithstanding, the survey underscores the fact that, with respect to the teaching role of colleges and universities, State and local government and intergovernmental relations have not really entered—or, from the vantage point of the twenties and thirties, reentered—the "mainstream" of the political science discipline. It is equally clear that for a number of good reasons these fields deserve far more attention than they are currently receiving. Not the least of these reasons is the crucial role of higher educational institutions as training grounds for future public servants. Moreover, students and instructors cannot really come to grips with the roots of the urban crisis, the plight of rural America, and the pathology of racial discord if the intergovernmental dimensions of these critical public policy questions are ignored in the classroom.

APPENDIX A-1

ACIR–APSA QUESTIONNAIRE

(To Departmental Chairmen)

1. To what extent does your introductory course in Political Science include treatment of American State and local government?

   None _____ Some _____ Substantial _____

   Please indicate the duration of the introductory course:

   one (semester, quarter, trimester) _____

   two (semesters, quarters, trimesters) _____

   three (semesters, quarters, trimesters) _____

   four (semesters, quarters, trimesters) _____

2. What approximate proportion of the lecture time is allocated to State and local government?

   one half _____ one fourth _____

   one third _____ less than one fourth _____

   none _____

3. What approximate proportion of the course-related reading is given over to State and local government?

   one half _____ one fourth _____

   one third _____ less than one fourth _____

   none _____

4. What works are used for introductory reading assignments in State and local government?

   Author Book

   _____

5. How many intermediate or advanced courses in the field of American State and/or local government and intergovernmental relations does your department offer?

_____ (cite total number) _____ in local government

_____ in State government _____ in State and local government

_____ in intergovernmental relations

6. What works are used for reading assignments in such intermediate or advanced courses? (After each title, please use the appropriate course designation: (I) = Intergovernmental Relations; (S-L) = State and Local Government; (S) = State Government; (L) = Local Government).

Author Book

_____

7. How useful have ACIR reports been in courses concerning American State and/or local government?

Very useful _____ Occasionally useful _____ Not useful _____

In intergovernmental relations courses?

Very useful _____ Occasionally useful _____ Not useful _____

APPENDIX A-2(A)

RESPONDENTS TO ACIR-APSA QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

(By Institutional Size, Location, and Control)

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total N	Total %	Regional, Public-Private Distribution: New England Pub	New England Pri	Mid-east Pub	Mid-east Pri	Great Lakes Pub	Great Lakes Pri	Plains Pub	Plains Pri	South-east Pub	South-east Pri	South-west Pub	South-west Pri	Rocky Mountain Pub	Rocky Mountain Pri	Far West Pub	Far West Pri
Total	562	100.0	9	32	32	76	30	66	28	44	60	68	26	18	12	8	26	27
Under 1,000	102	18.1	1	6	1	16	–	11	2	17	–	35	1	4	1	2	–	5
1,000 – 1,999	148	26.3	1	14	2	25	–	32	2	19	9	19	1	5	1	2	3	13
2,000 – 3,499	74	13.2	1	5	4	10	1	9	2	5	13	8	2	4	2	2	1	5
3,500 – 4,999	45	8.0	1	1	9	5	2	3	6	–	7	2	3	1	–	–	4	1
5,000 – 7,499	51	9.1	2	2	3	7	3	3	3	1	9	1	6	3	5	–	2	1
7,500 – 9,999	43	7.7	1	3	4	5	3	3	4	–	9	2	3	1	1	1	3	–
10,000 – 14,999	42	7.5	1	–	1	5	10	4	2	2	7	1	2	–	1	–	5	1
15,000 – 19,999	29	5.2	1	–	1	2	4	1	5	–	5	–	4	–	1	–	4	1
20,000 or over	28	5.0	–	1	7	1	7	–	2	–	1	–	4	–	–	1	4	–

APPENDIX A-2(B)

NON-RESPONDENTS TO ACIR-APSA QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

(By Institutional Size, Location, and Control)

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total N	Total %	Regional, Public-Private Distribution															
			New England		Mid-east		Great Lakes		Plains		South-east		South-west		Rocky Mountain		Far West	
			Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	321	100.0	4	27	5	53	10	36	13	28	33	57	9	8	3	4	8	23
Under 1,000	97	30.2	–	10	–	17	–	13	1	15	2	24	–	3	–	3	–	9
1,000 – 1,999	110	34.3	1	7	–	20	–	18	1	12	4	28	4	4	1	1	1	8
2,000 – 3,499	40	12.5	–	6	1	6	2	2	3	–	9	4	1	1	–	–	2	3
3,500 – 4,999	17	5.3	–	–	1	1	2	–	1	1	7	1	2	–	–	–	–	1
5,000 – 7,499	22	6.8	2	–	2	3	1	1	5	–	4	–	1	–	–	–	2	1
7,500 – 9,999	16	5.0	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	–	5	–	1	–	1	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	5	1.5	–	1	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1
15,000 – 19,999	6	1.9	–	–	–	2	1	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
20,000 or over	8	2.5	–	1	–	2	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–

APPENDIX A-3

NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS INCLUDED IN SURVEY
(By Region and State)

	No. of Institutions Sent Question-naires	Institutions Replying No.	%
NEW ENGLAND			
Connecticut	16	7	43
Maine	4	3	75
Massachusetts	34	20	59
New Hampshire	7	4	57
Rhode Island	4	3	75
Vermont	7	4	57
GREAT LAKES			
Illinois	42	23	55
Indiana	20	13	65
Michigan	22	17	77
Ohio	37	28	76
Wisconsin	21	15	71
SOUTHEAST			
Alabama	16	10	63
Arkansas	15	8	53
Florida	12	4	33
Georgia	22	13	59
Kentucky	17	8	47
Louisiana	15	9	60
Mississippi	11	8	73
North Carolina	27	10	37
South Carolina	15	10	67
Tennessee	29	19	66
Virginia	24	20	83
West Virginia	15	9	60
ROCKY MOUNTAIN			
Colorado	9	7	78
Idaho	5	4	80
Montana	7	6	86
Utah	5	2	40
Wyoming	1	1	100
MIDEAST			
Delaware	1	1	100
District of Columbia	8	4	50
Maryland	14	8	57
New Jersey	14	10	71
New York	65	45	69
Pennsylvania	64	40	63
PLAINS			
Iowa	22	12	55
Kansas	18	10	56
Minnesota	19	15	79
Missouri	22	13	59
Nebraska	17	13	76
North Dakota	5	2	40
South Dakota	10	7	70
SOUTHWEST			
Arizona	3	3	100
New Mexico	7	6	86
Oklahoma	12	8	67
Texas	39	27	69
FAR WEST			
Alaska	1	1	100
California	56	36	64
Hawaii	1	1	100
Nevada	1	0	0
Oregon	10	6	60
Washington	15	9	60
Total	883	562	64

339-650 O - 69 - 4

APPENDIX B

EXTENT OF TREATMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INTRODUCTORY POLITICAL SCIENCE COURSE

(By Institutional Size, Location, and Control)

TABLE B-1: NEW ENGLAND

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution					
			None		Some		Substantial	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	10	28	4	5	6	21	–	2
Under 1,000	1	6	1	1	–	4	–	1
1,000 – 1,999	2	12	–	2	2	9	–	1
2,000 – 3,499	1	4	–	1	1	3	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	1	1	–	–	1	1	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	2	2	1	–	1	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	2	–	–	1	2	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–

TABLE B-2: MIDEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution					
			None		Some		Substantial	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	33	77	10	22	18	46	5	9
Under 1,000	1	16	–	6	–	10	1	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	25	–	7	1	14	1	4
2,000 – 3,499	4	9	3	1	1	7	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	10	6	3	2	5	3	2	1
5,000 – 7,499	3	7	1	2	2	4	–	1
7,500 – 9,999	4	5	1	1	3	3	–	1
10,000 – 14,999	1	5	–	2	–	3	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	3	–	–	1	2	–	1
20,000 or over	7	1	2	1	5	–	–	–

TABLE B-3: GREAT LAKES

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution					
			None		Some		Substantial	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	29	43	5	7	15	27	9	9
Under 1,000	2	16	1	3	1	10	–	3
1,000 – 1,999	2	19	–	3	–	12	2	4
2,000 – 3,499	2	5	1	–	–	3	1	2
3,500 – 4,999	7	–	1	–	3	–	3	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	–	1	–	1	–	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	1	–	–	3	1	1	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	2	–	1	2	1	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	5	–	1	–	3	–	1	–
20,000 or over	2	–	–	–	2	–	–	–

TABLE B-4: PLAINS

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution					
			None		Some		Substantial	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	30	63	13	22	13	30	4	11
Under 1,000	–	10	–	2	–	5	–	3
1,000 – 1,999	–	31	–	12	–	16	–	3
2,000 – 3,499	1	9	1	2	–	5	–	2
3,500 – 4,999	2	3	–	2	2	–	–	1
5,000 – 7,499	4	2	2	–	2	1	–	1
7,500 – 9,999	3	3	2	1	1	1	–	1
10,000 – 14,999	10	4	3	3	5	1	2	–
15,000 – 19,999	3	1	2	–	–	1	1	–
20,000 or over	7	–	3	–	3	–	1	–

TABLE B-5: SOUTHEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution					
			None		Some		Substantial	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	56	68	12	12	32	37	12	19
Under 1,000	–	34	–	4	–	20	–	10
1,000 – 1,999	8	20	1	4	5	11	2	5
2,000 – 3,499	14	8	4	1	6	4	4	3
3,500 – 4,999	5	2	–	1	4	–	1	1
5,000 – 7,499	8	1	2	–	3	1	3	–
7,500 – 9,999	9	2	3	2	6	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	7	1	1	–	5	1	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	1	–	3	–	–	–
20,000 or over	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–

TABLE B-6: SOUTHWEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution					
			None		Some		Substantial	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	17	4	2	8	6	14	9
Under 1,000	1	4	–	–	1	2	–	2
1,000 – 1,999	1	5	–	1	1	2	–	2
2,000 – 3,499	2	3	1	–	1	2	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	3	1	1	–	–	–	2	1
5,000 – 7,499	6	3	–	1	2	–	4	2
7,500 – 9,999	3	1	–	–	1	–	2	1
10,000 – 14,999	2	–	–	–	1	–	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	2	–	1	–	1	–
20,000 or over	4	–	–	–	–	–	4	–

TABLE B-7: ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution					
			None		Some		Substantial	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	13	6	4	1	6	4	3	1
Under 1,000	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	2	–	–	2	2	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	2	–	–	1	1	1	1
3,500 – 4,999	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	5	–	3	–	1	–	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	1	1	–	–	1	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–

TABLE B-8: FAR WEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution					
			None		Some		Substantial	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	27	4	3	18	20	4	4
Under 1,000	–	5	–	1	–	3	–	1
1,000 – 1,999	3	12	1	2	2	9	–	1
2,000 – 3,499	1	6	1	–	–	5	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	4	1	1	–	1	–	2	1
5,000 – 7,499	2	1	–	–	2	1	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	–	–	–	3	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	5	1	–	–	4	1	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	1	–	–	3	1	1	–
20,000 or over	4	–	1	–	3	–	–	–

APPENDIX C

APPROXIMATE PROPORTION OF LECTURE TIME ALLOCATED TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INTRODUCTORY POLITICAL SCIENCE COURSE

(By Institutional Size, Location, and Control)

TABLE C-1: NEW ENGLAND

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	10	28	–	–	–	1	–	3	6	20	4	4
Under 1,000	1	6	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	3	1	1
1,000 – 1,999	2	12	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	11	–	1
2,000 – 3,499	1	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	3	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	2	1
7,500 – 9,999	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–

TABLE C-2: MIDEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	32	71	3	2	1	3	2	7	16	36	10	23
Under 1,000	1	15	1	–	–	1	–	1	–	8	–	5
1,000 – 1,999	2	24	1	2	–	–	1	3	–	12	–	7
2,000 – 3,499	4	8	–	–	–	1	–	2	1	4	3	1
3,500 – 4,999	9	5	–	–	1	–	–	1	5	2	3	2
5,000 – 7,499	3	7	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	4	1	3
7,500 – 9,999	4	4	–	–	–	1	–	–	3	1	1	2
10,000 – 14,999	1	5	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	2
15,000 – 19,999	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	2	–	–
20,000 or over	7	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	–	2	1

TABLE C-3: GREAT LAKES

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	28	60	–	5	–	–	1	7	15	26	12	22
Under 1,000	–	10	–	1	–	–	–	2	–	5	–	2
1,000 – 1,999	–	28	–	3	–	–	–	1	–	14	–	10
2,000 – 3,499	–	10	–	1	–	–	–	2	–	4	–	3
3,500 – 4,999	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	2
5,000 – 7,499	4	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	2	–	2	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	2	2	1
10,000 – 14,999	10	4	–	–	–	–	–	1	5	–	5	3
15,000 – 19,999	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	1	1
20,000 or over	7	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	4	–	2	–

TABLE C-4: PLAINS

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	25	40	3	3	2	2	5	8	10	19	5	8
Under 1,000	2	14	–	1	–	1	–	2	1	7	1	3
1,000 – 1,999	2	18	1	–	–	1	–	5	1	8	–	4
2,000 – 3,499	2	5	–	2	1	–	–	1	–	2	1	–
3,500 – 4,999	4	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	1	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	1	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	3	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	1	–	1
15,000 – 19,999	5	–	1	–	1	–	1	–	1	–	1	–
20,000 or over	2	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–

TABLE C-5: SOUTHEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	55	63	8	11	3	6	10	12	21	24	13	10
Under 1,000	–	30	–	4	–	6	–	8	–	9	–	3
1,000 – 1,999	8	19	2	3	–	–	2	2	3	11	1	3
2,000 – 3,499	13	7	3	3	2	–	4	1	1	2	3	1
3,500 – 4,999	5	2	–	–	1	–	1	1	2	–	1	1
5,000 – 7,499	8	2	2	1	–	–	–	–	4	1	2	–
7,500 – 9,999	9	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	6	–	3	2
10,000 – 14,999	7	1	1	–	–	–	1	–	3	1	2	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	2	–	1	–
20,000 or over	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE C-6: SOUTHWEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	25	16	2	3	6	3	5	–	9	8	3	2
Under 1,000	1	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	3	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	5	–	1	–	1	–	–	1	2	–	1
2,000 – 3,499	2	4	–	1	–	–	–	–	2	3	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	3	1	–	–	2	1	–	–	–	–	1	–
5,000 – 7,499	6	2	1	–	2	1	1	–	2	–	–	1
7,500 – 9,999	3	1	–	1	2	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	2	–
20,000 or over	3	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	1	–	–	–

TABLE C-7: ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	13	7	–	2	3	–	3	1	3	3	4	1
Under 1,000	1	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	2	–	–	–	–	2	1	–	1	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	1	–	1	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	5	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	3	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1

TABLE C-8: FAR WEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	25	27	–	1	3	3	4	5	14	16	4	2
Under 1,000	–	5	–	–	–	2	–	2	–	–	–	1
1,000 – 1,999	3	12	–	1	–	1	–	1	2	8	1	1
2,000 – 3,499	1	6	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	5	1	–
3,500 – 4,999	4	1	–	–	–	–	1	1	2	–	1	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	1	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	2	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	5	1	–	–	2	–	–	–	3	1	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	1	–	–
20,000 or over	3	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	1	–

APPENDIX D

APPROXIMATE PROPORTION OF COURSE-RELATED READING ALLOCATED TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INTRODUCTORY POLITICAL SCIENCE COURSE

(By Institutional Size, Location, and Control)

TABLE D-1: NEW ENGLAND

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	10	27	–	–	–	2	–	2	6	18	4	5
Under 1,000	1	6	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	3	1	1
1,000 – 1,999	2	11	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	9	–	2
2,000 – 3,499	1	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	3	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	2	1
7,500 – 9,999	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–

TABLE D-2: MIDEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	32	71	3	1	1	4	–	6	18	36	10	24
Under 1,000	1	15	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	9	–	5
1,000 – 1,999	2	24	1	1	–	1	–	3	1	11	–	8
2,000 – 3,499	4	8	–	–	–	1	–	2	1	4	3	1
3,500 – 4,999	9	5	–	–	1	–	–	1	5	2	3	2
5,000 – 7,499	3	7	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	4	1	3
7,500 – 9,999	4	4	–	–	–	1	–	–	3	1	1	2
10,000 – 14,999	1	5	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	2
15,000 – 19,999	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	2	–	–
20,000 or over	7	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	–	2	1

TABLE D-3: GREAT LAKES

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	27	60	1	5	–	–	1	5	13	27	12	23
Under 1,000	–	10	–	1	–	–	–	2	–	5	–	2
1,000 – 1,999	–	28	–	3	–	–	–	1	–	13	–	11
2,000 – 3,499	–	10	–	1	–	–	–	2	–	3	–	4
3,500 – 4,999	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	1	–	1
5,000 – 7,499	4	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	1	2	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	2	2	1
10,000 – 14,999	9	4	1	–	–	–	–	–	4	1	4	3
15,000 – 19,999	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	1	1
20,000 or over	7	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	3	–	3	–

TABLE D-4: PLAINS

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	24	39	3	3	2	2	4	7	9	18	6	9
Under 1,000	2	14	–	1	–	1	–	2	1	7	1	3
1,000 – 1,999	2	18	1	–	–	1	–	4	1	8	–	5
2,000 – 3,499	2	5	–	2	1	–	–	1	–	2	1	–
3,500 – 4,999	4	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	2	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	1
15,000 – 19,999	5	–	1	–	1	–	1	–	1	–	1	–
20,000 or over	2	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE D-5: SOUTHEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	54	63	8	9	3	4	8	10	19	27	16	13
Under 1,000	–	30	–	3	–	3	–	9	–	11	–	4
1,000 – 1,999	8	19	2	2	–	1	2	1	3	11	1	4
2,000 – 3,499	13	7	3	3	2	–	3	–	2	2	3	2
3,500 – 4,999	5	2	–	–	1	–	1	–	2	1	1	1
5,000 – 7,499	8	2	2	1	–	–	–	–	2	1	4	–
7,500 – 9,999	9	2	–	–	–	–	1	–	5	–	3	2
10,000 – 14,999	7	1	1	–	–	–	1	–	2	1	3	–
15,000 – 19,999	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	–	–
20,000 or over	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–

TABLE D-6: SOUTHWEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	25	15	4	3	6	3	4	–	7	7	4	2
Under 1,000	1	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	3	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	5	–	1	–	1	–	–	1	2	–	1
2,000 – 3,499	2	3	–	–	–	1	–	–	1	2	1	–
3,500 – 4,999	3	1	1	–	–	1	1	–	–	–	1	–
5,000 – 7,499	6	2	1	1	3	–	–	–	2	–	–	1
7,500 – 9,999	3	1	–	1	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	2	–
20,000 or over	3	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–

TABLE D-7: ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	13	7	–	2	3	–	4	–	2	2	4	3
Under 1,000	1	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	1
1,000 – 1,999	2	2	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	1	–	1
2,000 – 3,499	2	1	–	1	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	5	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	3	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1

TABLE D-8: FAR WEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			1/2		1/3		1/4		Less Than 1/4		None	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	25	27	–	1	3	1	6	9	12	13	4	3
Under 1,000	–	5	–	–	–	–	–	4	–	–	–	1
1,000 – 1,999	3	12	–	1	–	1	1	1	1	8	1	1
2,000 – 3,499	1	6	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	3	1	1
3,500 – 4,999	4	1	–	–	–	–	1	1	2	–	1	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	1	–	–	–	–	1	1	1	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	2	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	5	1	–	–	2	–	–	–	3	1	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	3	1	–	–
20,000 or over	3	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	1	–

APPENDIX E

TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED COURSES IN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

(By Institutional Size, Location, and Control)

TABLE E-1: NEW ENGLAND

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	8	30	–	8	1	13	1	3	3	3	3	3
Under 1,000	–	6	–	2	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	12	–	5	–	5	1	1	–	1	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	1	5	–	–	–	2	–	2	1	–	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	3	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	2	1
7,500 – 9,999	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	1
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE E-2: MIDEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	33	74	6	12	8	29	10	20	3	3	6	10
Under 1,000	1	15	1	5	–	7	–	2	–	1	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	25	1	4	–	15	1	4	–	–	–	2
2,000 – 3,499	4	9	2	3	–	1	2	2	–	2	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	10	5	–	–	5	2	5	1	–	–	–	2
5,000 – 7,499	3	7	1	–	2	2	–	5	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	5	1	–	1	1	2	2	–	–	–	2
10,000 – 14,999	1	5	–	–	–	1	–	3	–	–	1	1
15,000 – 19,999	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	1	1
20,000 or over	7	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	4	1

TABLE E-3: GREAT LAKES

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	29	65	1	18	4	28	7	9	5	5	12	5
Under 1,000	–	10	–	4	–	6	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	–	32	–	9	–	18	–	3	–	2	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	–	9	–	3	–	2	–	3	–	–	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	2	3	–	–	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	1
5,000 – 7,499	4	2	–	1	1	–	1	1	1	–	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	3	1	1	–	–	1	1	–	1	1	–
10,000 – 14,999	10	4	–	–	1	–	3	–	1	2	5	2
15,000 – 19,999	3	2	–	–	–	–	1	1	1	–	1	1
20,000 or over	7	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	2	–	4	–

TABLE E-4: PLAINS

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	28	42	3	16	4	18	5	3	3	2	13	3
Under 1,000	2	16	2	8	–	6	–	1	–	–	–	1
1,000 – 1,999	2	18	1	6	–	9	1	2	–	1	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	5	–	2	2	3	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	6	–	–	–	1	–	2	–	2	–	1	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	1	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	1	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	2	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	2
15,000 – 19,999	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	–
20,000 or over	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–

TABLE E-5: SOUTHEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	57	68	6	26	10	22	15	8	8	4	18	8
Under 1,000	–	33	–	17	–	9	–	4	–	1	–	2
1,000 – 1,999	8	20	2	6	3	9	1	4	1	1	1	–
2,000 – 3,499	13	8	3	2	4	3	5	–	1	2	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	6	2	1	–	–	1	3	–	1	–	1	1
5,000 – 7,499	8	2	–	1	1	–	4	–	1	–	2	1
7,500 – 9,999	9	2	–	–	–	–	2	–	2	–	5	2
10,000 – 14,999	8	1	–	–	2	–	–	–	2	–	4	1
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	–
20,000 or over	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–

TABLE E-6: SOUTHWEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	18	1	1	3	11	7	4	4	1	11	1
Under 1,000	1	5	1	–	–	4	–	1	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	5	–	–	1	3	–	1	–	–	–	1
2,000 – 3,499	2	3	–	1	–	–	1	2	1	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	3	1	–	–	–	–	2	–	1	1	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	6	3	–	–	2	3	1	–	1	–	2	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	1	–	–	–	1	1	–	1	–	1	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	2	–
20,000 or over	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	–

LD 42

TABLE E-7: ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	13	6	2	2	2	1	1	–	–	1	8	2
Under 1,000	1	2	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
1,000 – 1,999	2	2	2	–	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	1	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	1	–
3,500 – 4,999	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	5	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	4	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1

TABLE E-8: FAR WEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	27	1	11	4	9	4	3	5	1	12	3
Under 1,000	–	5	–	3	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	3	13	–	6	2	5	1	2	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	1	6	–	1	–	2	–	1	1	–	–	2
3,500 – 4,999	4	1	–	–	1	1	1	–	2	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	2	–
10,000 – 14,999	5	1	–	1	–	–	2	–	–	–	3	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	1
20,000 or over	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	2	–

APPENDIX F

NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED COURSES IN STATE-LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(By Institutional Size, Location, and Control)

TABLE F-1: NEW ENGLAND

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	8	30	1	15	6	15	–	–	1	–	–	–
Under 1,000	–	6	–	3	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	12	–	6	1	6	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	1	5	–	1	1	4	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	1	1	–	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	3	1	3	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	2	–	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE F-2: MIDEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	33	72	14	35	18	37	1	–	–	–	–	–
Under 1,000	1	15	1	9	–	6	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	25	2	13	–	12	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	5	8	4	3	1	5	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	9	4	–	2	9	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	7	2	2	1	5	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	5	2	3	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	5	1	2	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	2	1	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	7	1	1	1	5	–	1	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE F-3: GREAT LAKES

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	28	62	13	27	15	34	–	–	–	–	–	1
Under 1,000	–	10	–	6	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	–	30	–	14	–	16	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	–	9	–	3	–	6	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	2	3	–	1	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	1
5,000 – 7,499	4	2	–	1	4	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	3	2	1	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	9	3	4	1	5	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	3	2	2	–	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	7	–	5	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE F-4: PLAINS

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	28	42	15	22	8	17	4	3	1	–	–	–
Under 1,000	2	17	2	10	–	6	–	1	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	17	1	7	–	9	1	1	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	5	1	3	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	6	–	2	–	3	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	1	1	–	1	–	–	1	1	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	–	2	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	2	1	2	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	5	–	3	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	2	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE F-5: SOUTHEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	54	66	19	38	24	26	7	2	3	–	1	–
Under 1,000	–	32	–	22	–	10	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	8	20	3	10	5	9	–	1	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	13	8	7	4	4	4	2	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	5	1	3	–	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	8	2	1	1	5	1	1	–	–	–	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	8	2	2	1	3	–	3	1	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	7	1	3	–	3	1	1	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	2	–	–	–
20,000 or over	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–

TABLE F-6: SOUTHWEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	18	13	6	11	11	2	–	–	1	–	–
Under 1,000	1	5	1	1	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	5	–	1	1	3	–	–	–	1	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	3	1	2	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	3	1	1	–	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	6	3	2	2	3	1	1	–	–	–	–	–
7,599 – 9,999	3	1	2	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	2	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	4	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE F-7: ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	12	7	6	2	5	2	1	3	–	–	–	–
Under 1,000	1	2	–	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	2	2	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	1	–	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	4	–	2	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE F-8: FAR WEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	28	10	15	14	12	1	–	1	–	–	1
Under 1,000	–	5	–	3	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	3	13	1	8	2	5	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	4	6	–	2	1	3	–	–	–	–	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	4	1	2	–	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	1	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	–	–	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	5	1	3	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	1	2	–	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	4	–	1	–	1	–	1	–	1	–	–	–

APPENDIX G

NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED COURSES IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(By Institutional Size, Location, and Control)

TABLE G-1: NEW ENGLAND

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	8	30	2	21	4	4	1	4	–	–	1	1
Under 1,000	–	6	–	5	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	12	1	11	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	1	5	–	3	1	–	–	2	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	1	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	3	–	1	–	1	1	1	–	–	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	2	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	1
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE G-2: MIDEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	33	74	15	34	12	32	5	6	1	1	–	1
Under 1,000	1	15	1	11	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	26	1	16	1	10	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	4	8	3	3	1	4	–	–	–	–	–	1
3,500 – 4,999	10	5	6	1	4	2	–	2	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	7	2	2	1	5	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	5	2	1	2	2	–	1	–	1	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	5	–	–	–	4	1	1	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	2	–	–	–	1	1	1	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	7	1	–	–	3	–	3	1	1	–	–	–

TABLE G-3: GREAT LAKES

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	27	65	4	46	9	15	5	1	2	1	8	1
Under 1,000	–	10	–	8	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	–	32	–	28	–	3	–	1	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	–	9	–	5	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	2	3	2	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	3	1	2	1	–	1	–	–	–	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	3	1	1	1	2	–	–	1	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	9	3	–	–	2	2	4	–	1	–	2	1
15,000 – 19,999	3	2	–	–	2	1	–	–	–	1	1	–
20,000 or over	7	–	–	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	4	–

TABLE G-4: PLAINS

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	28	42	10	33	5	7	9	–	1	1	3	1
Under 1,000	2	17	2	14	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	17	2	15	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	5	1	4	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	6	–	3	–	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	1	1	–	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	1	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	2	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	1	–	1
15,000 – 19,999	5	–	–	–	1	–	3	–	–	–	1	–
20,000 or over	2	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	1	–

TABLE G-5: SOUTHEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	56	67	23	53	22	8	4	5	5	–	2	1
Under 1,000	–	32	–	30	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	8	20	7	17	1	3	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	13	8	10	4	3	3	–	1	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	5	2	1	1	4	–	–	1	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	8	2	3	1	3	–	–	1	2	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	9	2	–	–	5	–	1	2	3	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	8	1	1	–	3	–	3	–	–	–	1	1
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	–	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
20,000 or over	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE G-6: SOUTHWEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	18	6	12	9	6	8	–	1	–	2	–
Under 1,000	1	5	1	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	5	1	4	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	3	–	1	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	3	1	2	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	6	3	2	1	2	2	2	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	1	–	1	1	–	1	–	1	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	–	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
20,000 or over	4	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	–	–	1	–

TABLE G-7: ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	13	6	6	4	3	1	2	1	–	–	2	–
Under 1,000	1	2	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	1	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	1	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	5	–	2	–	1	–	2	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE G-8: FAR WEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	25	28	5	25	8	–	7	2	3	1	2	–
Under 1,000	–	5	–	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	3	13	2	13	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	–	6	–	4	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	4	1	1	1	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	1	–	–	–	–	1	–	1	1	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	5	1	–	1	3	–	2	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	1	1	1	–	–	2	–	–	–	1	–
20,000 or over	4	–	–	–	1	–	2	–	–	–	1	–

APPENDIX H

NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED COURSES IN STATE GOVERNMENT

(By Institutional Size, Location, and Control)

TABLE H-1: NEW ENGLAND

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	8	30	4	27	2	3	1	–	–	–	1	–
Under 1,000	–	6	–	6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	12	1	12	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	1	5	1	4	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	1	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	3	–	2	–	1	1	–	–	–	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	2	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE H-2: MIDEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	33	74	24	62	8	11	1	1	–	–	–	–
Under 1,000	1	15	1	14	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	25	1	21	1	4	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	4	9	2	8	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	10	5	9	4	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	7	3	6	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	5	3	4	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	5	–	3	–	2	1	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	2	–	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	7	1	5	–	2	–	–	1	–	–	–	–

TABLE H-3: GREAT LAKES

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	28	64	13	58	11	5	1	–	2	1	1	–
Under 1,000	–	10	–	10	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	–	32	–	31	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	–	9	–	8	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	2	3	2	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	4	2	4	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	3	1	2	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	9	3	4	2	5	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	3	2	1	1	1	–	–	–	1	1	–	–
20,000 or over	7	–	1	–	3	–	1	–	1	–	1	–

TABLE H-4: PLAINS

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	28	42	14	38	8	2	1	2	1	–	–	–
Under 1,000	2	17	2	16	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	17	2	16	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	5	2	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	6	–	4	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	1	2	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	–	2	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	2	–	–	1	–	1	2	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	5	–	–	–	2	–	3	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	2	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE H-5: SOUTHEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	55	67	32	58	16	7	4	2	2	–	1	–
Under 1,000	–	32	–	30	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	7	20	6	17	1	3	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	13	8	12	6	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	5	2	2	2	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	8	2	4	2	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	9	2	4	–	2	–	1	2	2	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	8	1	2	1	4	–	2	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	1	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
20,000 or over	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE H-6: SOUTHWEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	18	11	15	11	3	1	–	3	–	–	–
Under 1,000	1	5	1	4	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	5	1	4	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	3	–	2	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	3	1	1	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	6	3	5	3	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	1	–	1	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	2	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
20,000 or over	4	–	–	–	2	–	1	–	1	–	–	–

TABLE H-7: ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	13	7	7	5	2	2	2	–	1	–	1	–
Under 1,000	1	2	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	2	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	1	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	5	–	2	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	1	–	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE H-8: FAR WEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	28	10	23	12	3	4	1	–	1	–	–
Under 1,000	–	5	–	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	3	13	3	11	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	1	6	1	4	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	4	1	1	1	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	1	–	–	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	–	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	5	1	1	1	3	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	1	1	1	1	–	2	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	4	–	1	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

APPENDIX I

NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE AND ADVANCED COURSES IN INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

(By Institutional Size, Location, and Control)

TABLE I-1: NEW ENGLAND

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	9	29	2	23	4	7	2	–	–	–	–	–
Under 1,000	–	6	–	6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	12	–	9	1	3	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	1	5	–	3	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	1	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	3	–	2	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	2	1	–	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE I-2: MIDEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	33	74	26	61	7	10	–	2	–	1	–	–
Under 1,000	1	15	1	12	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	26	2	24	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	4	8	3	6	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	10	5	9	5	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	7	3	6	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	5	4	2	–	2	–	–	–	1	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	5	1	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	2	–	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	7	1	3	–	4	–	–	1	–	–	–	–

TABLE I-3: GREAT LAKES

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	28	63	16	54	11	7	1	1	–	1	–	–
Under 1,000	–	10	–	10	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	–	31	–	27	–	3	–	1	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	–	9	–	8	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	2	3	2	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	4	2	3	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	3	2	3	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	9	3	4	2	4	1	1	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	3	2	2	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	7	–	3	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE I-4: PLAINS

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	28	42	18	40	7	1	2	1	1	–	–	–
Under 1,000	2	17	2	15	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	17	1	17	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	5	2	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	6	–	4	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	3	1	2	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	4	–	1	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	2	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	5	–	3	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	2	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE I-5: SOUTHEAST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	56	67	41	53	10	11	2	3	3	–	–	–
Under 1,000	–	31	–	23	–	6	–	2	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	8	21	6	17	2	4	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	13	8	11	7	2	–	–	1	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	5	2	4	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	8	2	6	1	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	9	2	5	2	2	–	1	–	1	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	8	1	7	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	2	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–

TABLE I-6: SOUTHWEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	18	17	15	8	3	–	–	1	–	–	–
Under 1,000	1	5	1	4	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	1	5	1	4	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	3	2	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	3	1	1	–	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	6	3	4	3	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	1	2	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	2	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	3	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	4	–	2	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE I-7: ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	13	7	7	5	5	1	–	–	–	1	1	–
Under 1,000	1	2	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	2	2	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	2	1	–	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	5	–	3	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
7,500 – 9,999	1	1	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15,000 – 19,999	1	1	–	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

TABLE I-8: FAR WEST

Size of Institution (total enrollment)	Total Number		Distribution									
			0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri	Pub	Pri
Total	26	27	19	22	4	4	2	1	–	–	1	–
Under 1,000	–	5	–	4	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–
1,000 – 1,999	3	13	2	11	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
2,000 – 3,499	1	6	1	5	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
3,500 – 4,999	4	1	3	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5,000 – 7,499	2	1	2	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
7,500 – 9,999	3	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10,000 – 14,999	5	1	3	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
15,000 – 19,999	4	–	3	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
20,000 or over	4	–	2	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–

APPENDIX J

WORKS USED FOR READING ASSIGNMENTS IN INTRODUCTORY, INTERMEDIATE, AND ADVANCED COURSES IN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

(Ten Most Frequently Mentioned Works)

Introductory Course

1. Burns, James M., and Jack W. Peltason. *Government By the People.* 6th ed. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

2. Maddox, Russell W., and Robert F. Fuquay. *State and Local Governments.* Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand Press, 1962.

3. Adrian, Charles R. *State and Local Governments.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

4. Morlan, Robert L. *Capitol, Courthouse, and City Hall: Readings in American State and Local Government.* 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

5. Mitau, G. Theodore. *State and Local Government: Politics and Processes.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

6. Snider, Clyde F., and S. K. Gove. *American State and Local Government.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

7. Ogg, Frederick A., and R. Orman Ray. *Essentials of American National Government.* 9th ed. ed. William H. Young, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

8. Redford, Emmette S., David B. Truman, Alan F. Westin, and Robert C. Wood. *Politics and Government in the United States.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1965.

9. Ferguson, John H., and Dean E. McHenry. *Elements of American Government.* 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

10. Fesler, James W., ed. *The 50 States and Their Local Governments.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1967.

State-Local Government

1. Adrian, Charles R. *State and Local Governments.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

2. Mitau, G. Theodore. *State and Local Government: Politics and Processes.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

3. Lockard, Duane. *The Politics of State and Local Government.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

4. Snider, Clyde F., and S. K. Gove. *American State and Local Government.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

5. Fesler, James W., ed. *The 50 States and Their Local Governments.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1967.

6. Banfield, Edward C., and James Q. Wilson. *City Politics.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

7. Elazar, Daniel J. *American Federalism: A View From the States.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966.

8. Morlan, Robert L. *Capitol, Courthouse, and City Hall: Readings in American State and Local Government.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

9. Maddox, Russell W., and Robert F. Fuquay. *State and Local Governments.* Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand Press, 1962.

State Government

1. Jacob, Herbert, and Kenneth N. Vines, eds. *Politics in the American States.* Boston: Little, Brown, & Company, 1965.

2. Fesler, James W., ed. *The 50 States and Their Local Governments.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1967.

3. Crew, Robert E., Jr. *State Politics: Readings on Political Behavior.* Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1966.

4. Committee for Economic Development. *Modernizing State Government.* New York: Committee for Economic Development, July, 1967.

5. Lockard, Duane. *The Politics of State and Local Government.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

6. Mitau, G. Theodore. *State and Local Government: Politics and Processes.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

7. Maddox, Russell W., and Robert F. Fuquay. *State and Local Governments.* Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand Press, 1962.

8. Heard, Alexander, ed. *State Legislatures in American Politics.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

9. Munger, Frank, ed. *American State Politics: Readings for Comparative Analysis.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966.

10. Elazar, Daniel J. *American Federalism: A View From the States.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966.

Local Government

1. Adrian, Charles R., and Charles Press. *Governing Urban America.* 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1968.

2. Banfield, Edward C., and James Q. Wilson. *City Politics.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

3. Bollens, John C., and Henry J. Schmandt *The Metropolis: Its People, Politics, and Economic Life.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

4. Dahl, Robert A. *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

5. Williams, Oliver P., and Charles Press, eds. *Democracy in Urban America.* Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1961.

6. Blair, George S. *American Local Government.* New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

7. Danielson, Michael N., ed. *Metropolitan Politics: A Reader.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.

8. Banfield, Edward C., ed. *Urban Government: A Reader in Politics and Administration.* New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

9. Coulter, Phillip B., ed. *Politics of Metropolitan Areas: Selected Readings.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1967.

10. Greer, Scott. *Governing the Metropolis.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

Intergovernmental Relations

1. Elazar, Daniel J. *American Federalism: A View From the States.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966.

2. Graves, W. Brooke. *American Intergovernmental Relations; Their Origins, Historical Development, and Current Status.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964.

3. Goldwin, Robert A., ed. *A Nation of States: Essays on the American Federal System.* Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.

4. Bollens, John C., and Henry J. Schmandt *The Metropolis: Its People, Politics, and Economic Life.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

5. Wildavsky, Aaron, ed. *American Federalism in Perspective.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967.

6. Riker, William H. *Federalism: Origin, Operation, Significance.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1964.

7. Wheare, K. C. *Federal Government.* London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

8. Martin, Roscoe C. *The Cities and the Federal System.* New York: Atherton Press, 1965.

9. Greene, Lee S., and G. S. Parthemos. *American Government: Policies and Functions.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.

10. Ebenstein, William, C. Herman Pritchett, Henry A. Turner, and Dean Mann. *American Democracy in World Perspective.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1969 O - 339-650

PUBLISHED REPORTS OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS[1]

Coordination of State and Federal Inheritance, Estate and Gift Taxes. Report A-1, January 1961. 134 pages, printed.

Investment of Idle Cash Balances by State and Local Governments. Report A-3, January 1961. 61 pages (out of print; summary available).

Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas. Report A-5, July 1961. 83 pages; U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Government Operations, Committee Print, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.

State and Local Taxation of Privately Owned Property Located on Federal Areas. Report A-6, June 1961. 34 pages, offset (out of print; summary available).

Periodic Congressional Reassessment of Federal Grants-in-Aid to State and Local Governments. Report A-8, June 1961. 67 pages, offset (reproduced in Appendix of *Hearings on S. 2114 Before the U.S. Senate, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations.* January 14, 15 and 16, 1964. 88th Cong. 2d Sess.

Local Nonproperty Taxes and the Coordinating Role of the State. Report A-9, September 1961. 68 pages, offset.

Alternative Approaches to Governmental Reorganization in Metropolitan Areas. Report A-11, June 1962. 88 pages, offset.

Intergovernmental Responsibilities for Water Supply and Sewage Disposal in Metropolitan Areas. Report A-13, October 1962. 135 pages, offset.

Transferability of Public Employee Retirement Credits Among Units of Government. Report A-16, March 1963. 92 pages, offset.

**The Role of the States in Strengthening the Property Tax.* Report A-17, June 1963. Vol. I (187 pages) and Vol. II (182 pages), printed. $1.25 ea.

Statutory and Administrative Controls Associated with Federal Grants for Public Assistance. Report A-21, May 1964. 108 pages, printed.

The Problem of Special Districts in American Government. Report A-22, May 1964. 112 pages, printed.

The Intergovernmental Aspects of Documentary Taxes. Report A-23, September 1964. 29 pages, offset.

State-Federal Overlapping in Cigarette Taxes. Report A-24, September 1964. 62 pages, offset.

**Metropolitan Social and Economic Disparities: Implications for Intergovernmental Relations in Central Cities and Suburbs.* Report A-25, January 1965, 253 pages, offset. $1.25.

Relocation: Unequal Treatment of People and Businesses Displaced by Governments. Report A-26, January 1965. 141 pages, offset.

Federal-State Coordination of Personal Income Taxes. Report A-27, October 1965. 203 pages, offset.

Building Codes: A Program for Intergovernmental Reform. Report A-28, January 1966. 103 pages, offset.

**Intergovernmental Relations in the Poverty Program.* Report A-29, April 1966. 278 pages, offset. $1.50.

**State-Local Taxation and Industrial Location.* Report A-30, April 1967. 114 pages, offset. 60¢.

**Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System.* Report A-31, October 1967. Vol. 1, 385 pages offset. $2.50; Vol. 2. *Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities.* 410 pages offset. $2.25.

**Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth.* Report A-32, April 1968. 186 pages, printed. $1.25.

**Intergovernmental Problems in Medicaid.* Report A-33. September 1968. 122 pages, offset. $1.25.

Factors Affecting the Voter Reactions to Governmental Reorganization in Metropolitan Areas. Report M-15, May 1962. 80 pages, offset.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. A Brochure. Report M-17, August 1968.

**Performance of Urban Functions: Local and Areawide.* Report M-21, September 1963. 281 pages, offset. $1.50.

State Technical Assistance to Local Debt Management. Report M-26, January 1965. 80 pages, offset.

**A Handbook for Interlocal Agreements and Contracts.* Report M-29, March 1967. 197 pages, offset. $1.00.

Metropolitan America: Challenge to Federalism. Report M-31, August 1966. 176 pages, offset.

Metropolitan Councils of Governments. Report M-32, August 1966. 69 pages, offset.

1968 State Legislative Program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Report M-35, September 1967. 629 pages, offset.

New Proposals for 1969: ACIR State Legislative Program. Report M-39, June 1968.

Tenth Annual Report. Report M-42, January 1969. 26 pp., offset.

[1] Single copies of reports may be obtained without charge from the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D. C. 20575.

*Multiple copies of items may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.